

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 10, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 4-6 have been amended, and claims 1-3 have been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 4-6 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 4-6 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,137, "Ono").

Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice, and therefore the rejection with respect to these claims is now moot. As for claims 4-6, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that each of these claims recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 4 recites an image recording apparatus comprising, among other features, means for storing, for each group of fields assigned the same camera number which are included in the time division multiplex image signal, image data as basic image data in the basic image storage means corresponding to the camera number assigned to the group of fields in a period of a predetermined number of fields as well as feeding the image data as it is, to the image compression means; and means for finding, with respect to image data for each group of fields assigned the same camera number which are included in the time division multiplex image signal, the difference between each of the image data corresponding to the fields between the field corresponding to the image

data which is stored in the basic image storage means and the field corresponding to the image data which is to be subsequently stored in the basic image storage means and the basic image data which has been most newly stored in the basic image storage means, and feeding data representing the obtained difference to the image compression means.

Claim 6 recites an image recording/reproducing apparatus comprising, among other features, means for storing, for each group of fields assigned the same camera number which are included in the time division multiplex image signal, image data as basic image data in the basic image storage means corresponding to the camera number assigned to the group of fields in a period of a predetermined number of fields as well as feeding the image data as it is, to the image compression means; and means for finding, with respect to image data for each group of fields assigned the same camera number which are included in the time division multiplex image signal, the difference between each of the image data corresponding to the fields between the field corresponding to the image data which is stored in the basic image storage means and the field corresponding to the image data which is to be subsequently stored in the basic image storage means and the basic image data which has been mostly newly stored in the basic image storage means, and feeding data representing the obtained difference to the image compression means.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicants' invention.

Ono discloses a MPEG encoding circuit 11. Moreover, Ono discloses a picture reordering circuit 71, a subtracter 72, switching circuits 73, 83, a DCT (Discrete Cosine

Transform) circuit 74, a quantization circuit 75, a variable-length encoding circuit 76, a buffer memory 77, an inverse-quantization circuit 78, an inverse DCT circuit 79, an addition circuit 80, an image memory 81, a motion compensation circuit 82, a picture type decision circuit 84, a rate control circuit 85, a camera code generation circuit 86, and a video multiplexer 87.

The MPEG encoding circuit of Ono performs encoding on three types of pictures repeatedly: Intra-frame encoding I (Intra-coded) picture, forward inter-frame predictive encoding P (Predictive-coded) picture, and bi-directionally inter-frame predictive encoding B (Bi-directionally predictive-coded) picture.

In making the rejection, the Office Action cites column 12, line 54 to column 13, line 68 and Figure 9, and characterize Ono as allegedly showing a “subtractor (72) [that] calculates the difference between the stored image data and the being input image data and finds the difference between the fields of the image data from the memory (81) and the fields of the image data being input and generates a difference data, the difference data is supplied to the compression means (74, 75, 76) and is compressed by the compression means.” (See page 11 of the Office Action.)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's characterization of Ono and submit that Ono fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 4 and 6 of the present application. In particular, it is submitted that the video data compression/playback system of Ono is neither comparable nor analogous to the image recording/reproducing apparatus of the present invention. For instance, the present invention includes “means for storing ...” and “means for finding ...” in order to reduce the recorded amount in an efficient manner and with a simple configuration.

Furthermore, the present invention determines the difference between input image data and the basic image data, where the difference between each of the image data corresponding to the fields between the field corresponding to the image data which is stored in the basic image storage means and the field corresponding to the image data which is to be subsequently stored in the basic image storage means and the basic image data which has been most newly stored in the basic image storage means. Hence, Applicants submit that Ono fails to disclose each and every element recited in claims 4 and 6 of the present application.

Moreover, to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Ono fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 4 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 6 are not anticipated by Ono. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 6 are allowable.

As claim 5 is dependent from independent claim 4, Applicants submit that this claim incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 4-6 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants also submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the

claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully request that claims 4-6 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810